



**University of  
Zurich**<sup>UZH</sup>

**Zurich Open Repository and  
Archive**

University of Zurich  
University Library  
Strickhofstrasse 39  
CH-8057 Zurich  
[www.zora.uzh.ch](http://www.zora.uzh.ch)

---

Year: 2016

---

## **Post-Priestly additions in the Pentateuch: a survey of scholarship**

Schmid, Konrad

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-138291>

Book Section

Originally published at:

Schmid, Konrad (2016). Post-Priestly additions in the Pentateuch: a survey of scholarship. In: Schmid, Konrad; Gertz, Jan; Levinson, Bernard; Rom-Shiloni, Dalit. The formation of the pentateuch: bridging the academic cultures of Europe, Israel, and North America. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 589-604.

# The Formation of the Pentateuch

Bridging the Academic Cultures of  
Europe, Israel, and North America

Edited by

Jan C. Gertz, Bernard M. Levinson,  
Dalit Rom-Shiloni, and Konrad Schmid

Mohr Siebeck

e-offprint of the author with publisher's permission

JAN C. GERTZ is Professor of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament at the Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg.

BERNARD M. LEVINSON is Professor of Jewish Studies and Hebrew Bible and of Law at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis.

DALIT ROM-SHILONI is Associate Professor of Hebrew Bible at the Department of Biblical Studies, Tel Aviv University.

KONRAD SCHMID is Professor of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament at the University of Zurich.

ISBN 978-3-16-153883-4

ISSN 0940-4155 (Forschungen zum Alten Testament)

Die Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2016 by Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. [www.mohr.de](http://www.mohr.de)

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Gulde Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

## Table of Contents

<i>Jan Christian Gertz, Bernard M. Levinson, Dalit Rom-Shiloni, Konrad Schmid</i> Convergence and Divergence in Pentateuchal Theory – The Genesis and Goals of This Volume . . . . .	1
--	---

### *Part One*

#### *Empirical Perspectives on the Composition of the Pentateuch*

<i>Jan Christian Gertz</i> Introduction . . . . .	11
<i>Christopher A. Rollston</i> Inscriptional Evidence for the Writing of the Earliest Texts of the Bible – Intellectual Infrastructure in Tenth- and Ninth-Century Israel, Judah, and the Southern Levant . . . . .	15
<i>David P. Wright</i> The Covenant Code Appendix (Exodus 23:20–33), Neo-Assyrian Sources, and Implications for Pentateuchal Study . . . . .	47
<i>David M. Carr</i> Data to Inform Ongoing Debates about the Formation of the Pentateuch – From Documented Cases of Transmission History to a Survey of Rabbinic Exegesis . . . . .	87
<i>Molly M. Zahn</i> Innerbiblical Exegesis – The View from beyond the Bible . . . . .	107
<i>Armin Lange</i> From Many to One – Some Thoughts on the Hebrew Textual History of the Torah . . . . .	121

*Part Two*  
*Can the Pentateuch Be Read in Its Present Form?*  
*Narrative Continuity in the Pentateuch*  
*in Comparative Perspective*

<i>Jeffrey Stackert</i>	
Introduction . . . . .	199
<i>Jean Louis Ska</i>	
What Do We Mean by Plot and by Narrative Continuity? . . . . .	201
<i>Yairah Amit</i>	
Travel Narratives and the Message of Genesis . . . . .	223
<i>Joel S. Baden</i>	
Why Is the Pentateuch Unreadable? – Or, Why Are We Doing This Anyway? . . . . .	243
<i>Jeffrey Stackert</i>	
Pentateuchal Coherence and the Science of Reading . . . . .	253
<i>Jean-Pierre Sonnet</i>	
Does the Pentateuch <i>Tell</i> of Its Redactional Genesis? – The Characters of YHWH and Moses as Agents of <i>Fortschreibung</i> in the Pentateuch's Narrated World . . . . .	269
<i>Joel S. Baden</i>	
Continuity between the Gaps – The Pentateuch and the Kirta Epic . . . . .	283

*Part Three*  
*The Role of Historical Linguistics in the Dating of Biblical Texts*

<i>Shimon Gesundheit</i>	
Introduction – The Strengths and Weaknesses of Linguistic Dating . . . . .	295
<i>Erhard Blum</i>	
The Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts – An Approach with Methodological Limitations . . . . .	303
<i>Jan Joosten</i>	
Diachronic Linguistics and the Date of the Pentateuch . . . . .	327

*William M. Schniedewind*

Linguistic Dating, Writing Systems, and the Pentateuchal Sources . . . . . 345

*Thomas Römer*

How to Date Pentateuchal Texts – Some Case Studies . . . . . 357

*Noam Mizrahi*

The Numeral 11 and the Linguistic Dating of P . . . . . 371

*Jakob Wöhrle*

There's No Master Key! – The Literary Character of the Priestly  
Stratum and the Formation of the Pentateuch . . . . . 391

*Frank H. Polak*

Oral Platform and Language Usage in the Abraham Narrative . . . . . 405

*Frank H. Polak*

Storytelling and Redaction – Varieties of Language Usage in the  
Exodus Narrative . . . . . 443

### *Part Four*

#### *The Significance of Second Temple Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls for the Formation of the Pentateuch*

*Bernard M. Levinson*

Introduction . . . . . 479

*Sidnie White Crawford*

What Constitutes a Scriptural Text? – The History of Scholarship on  
Qumran Manuscript 4Q158 . . . . . 483

*Molly M. Zahn*

Scribal Revision and the Composition of the Pentateuch –  
Methodological Issues . . . . . 491

*Reinhard G. Kratz*

Reworked Pentateuch and Pentateuchal Theory . . . . . 501

*Richard J. Bauckham*

Holy Seed – Ezra 9–10 and the Formation of the Pentateuch . . . . . 525

*Sara Japhet*

What May Be Learned from Ezra–Nehemiah about the Composition  
of the Pentateuch? . . . . . 543

*Part Five*  
*Evidence for Redactional Activity in the Pentateuch*

<i>Konrad Schmid</i>	
Introduction . . . . .	563
<i>Jean Louis Ska</i>	
Some Empirical Evidence in Favor of Redaction Criticism . . . . .	567
<i>Christoph Levin</i>	
The Pentateuch – A Compilation by Redactors . . . . .	579
<i>Konrad Schmid</i>	
Post-Priestly Additions in the Pentateuch – A Survey of Scholarship . . . .	589

*Part Six*  
*The Integration of Preexisting Literary Material in the  
Pentateuch and the Impact upon Its Final Shape*

<i>Joel S. Baden</i>	
Introduction . . . . .	607
<i>Rainer Albertz</i>	
Noncontinuous Literary Sources Taken Up in the Book of Exodus . . . . .	609
<i>Itamar Kislev</i>	
The Story of the Gadites and the Reubenites (Numbers 32) – A Case Study for an Approach to a Pentateuchal Text . . . . .	619
<i>Karin Finsterbusch</i>	
Integrating the Song of Moses into Deuteronomy and Reshaping the Narrative – Different Solutions in MT Deut 31:1–32:47 and (the Hebrew <i>Vorlage</i> of) LXX Deut 31:1–32:47 . . . . .	631
<i>David P. Wright</i>	
Source Dependence and the Development of the Pentateuch – The Case of Leviticus 24 . . . . .	651

*Part Seven*  
*Historical Geography of the Pentateuch*  
*and Archaeological Perspectives*

*Jan Christian Gertz*

Introduction . . . . . 685

*David Ben-Gad HaCohen*

Biblical Criticism from a Geographer's Perspective – "Transjordan"  
 as a Test Case . . . . . 687

*Israel Finkelstein and Thomas Römer*

Early North Israelite "Memories" of Moab . . . . . 711

*Thomas B. Dozeman*

The Historical Geography of the Pentateuch and Archaeological  
 Perspectives . . . . . 729

*Jan Christian Gertz*

Hezekiah, Moses, and the Nehushtan – A Case Study for a Correlation  
 between the History of Religion in the Monarchic Period and the  
 History of the Formation of the Hebrew Bible . . . . . 745

*Angela Roskop Erisman*

For the Border of the Ammonites Was . . . Where? – Historical  
 Geography and Biblical Interpretation in Numbers 21 . . . . . 761

*Part Eight*

*Do the Pentateuchal Sources Extend into the Former Prophets?*

*Konrad Schmid*

Introduction . . . . . 779

*Baruch J. Schwartz*

The Pentateuchal Sources and the Former Prophets –  
 A Neo-Documentarian's Perspective . . . . . 783

*Cynthia Edenburg*

Do the Pentateuchal Sources Extend into the Former Prophets? –  
 Joshua 1 and the Relation of the Former Prophets to the Pentateuch . . . . 795

*Thomas Römer*

The Problem of the Hexateuch . . . . . 813



## *Part Nine*

### *Rethinking the Relationship between the Law and the Prophets*

*Dalit Rom-Shiloni*

Introduction . . . . . 831

*Konrad Schmid*

The Prophets after the Law or the Law after the Prophets? –  
Terminological, Biblical, and Historical Perspectives . . . . . 841

*Marvin A. Sweeney*

Hosea's Reading of Pentateuchal Narratives – A Window for a  
Foundational E Stratum . . . . . 851

*Reinhard Achenbach*

The Sermon on the Sabbath in Jeremiah 17:19–27 and the Torah . . . . . 873

*Georg Fischer*

ותפשי התורה לא ידעוני – The Relationship of the Book of Jeremiah to  
the Torah . . . . . 891

*Dalit Rom-Shiloni*

Compositional Harmonization – Priestly and Deuteronomic  
References in the Book of Jeremiah – An Earlier Stage of a  
Recognized Interpretive Technique . . . . . 913

*John Kessler*

Patterns of Descriptive Curse Formulae in the Hebrew Bible, with  
Special Attention to Leviticus 26 and Amos 4:6–12 . . . . . 943

*Mark J. Boda*

Reading Zechariah 9–14 with the Law and the Prophets – Sibling  
Rivalry and Prophetic Crisis . . . . . 985

*Jakob Wöhrle*

Jacob, Moses, Levi – Pentateuchal Figures in the Book of the Twelve . . . 997

*Christophe L. Nihan*

Ezekiel and the Holiness Legislation – A Plea for Nonlinear Models . . . 1015

*Ariel Kopilovitz*

What Kind of Priestly Writings Did Ezekiel Know? . . . . . 1041

*Michael A. Lyons*

How Have We Changed? – Older and Newer Arguments about the  
Relationship between Ezekiel and the Holiness Code . . . . . 1055

*Tova Ganzel and Risa Levitt Kohn*

Ezekiel's Prophetic Message in Light of Leviticus 26 . . . . . 1075

### *Part Ten*

#### *Reading for Unity, Reading for Multiplicity – Theological Implications of the Study of the Pentateuch's Composition*

*Benjamin D. Sommer*

Introduction . . . . . 1087

*Benjamin D. Sommer*

Book or Anthology? – The Pentateuch as Jewish Scripture . . . . . 1091

*Markus Witte*

Methodological Reflections on a Theology of the Pentateuch . . . . . 1109

*Jean-Pierre Sonnet*

The Dynamic of Closure in the Pentateuch . . . . . 1121

*James W. Watts*

Narratives, Lists, Rhetoric, Ritual, and the Pentateuch as a Scripture . . . 1135

Contributors . . . . . 1147

#### *Ancient Sources Index*

Hebrew Bible . . . . . 1151

Ancient Near Eastern and Epigraphic Texts and Papyri. . . . . 1190

Deuterocanonical Works . . . . . 1192

Second Temple Literature . . . . . 1192

Texts from the Judean Desert . . . . . 1192

New Testament . . . . . 1194

Rabbinic Works . . . . . 1194

Early Christian Writings and Greco-Roman Literature . . . . . 1195

Medieval Writers . . . . . 1195

Author Index . . . . . 1197



# Post-Priestly Additions in the Pentateuch

## A Survey of Scholarship

*Konrad Schmid*

One of the coincidences of the history of scholarship of the Pentateuch is that the main epochs since Johann Gottfried Eichhorn fall into periods of about one hundred years. Eichhorn's *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* offered the first version of a two-source theory,<sup>1</sup> approximately a century later Julius Wellhausen formulated his version of the Documentary Hypothesis,<sup>2</sup> and then again about a century later in quick succession the works of John Van Seters,<sup>3</sup> Hans Heinrich Schmid,<sup>4</sup> and Rolf Rendtorff appeared.<sup>5</sup> Some have interpreted and continued to interpret these latter works as markers of a "crisis" in pentateuchal studies, but they actually indicate the collapse of an obsolete theoretical model for the Pentateuch, at least in the view of a rather significant strand of Hebrew Bible scholarship.<sup>6</sup> The advances of the most recent period of pentateuchal scholar-

---

This is an updated and reworked English translation of K. SCHMID, "Von der Diaskeuase zur nachendredaktionellen Fortschreibung: Die Geschichte der Erforschung der nachpriester-schriftlichen Redaktionsgeschichte des Pentateuch," in *The Post-Priestly Pentateuch: New Perspectives on Its Redactional Development and Theological Profiles* (ed. F. Giuntoli and K. Schmid; FAT 101; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 1–18. My thanks to Peter Altmann for taking care of the translation.

<sup>1</sup> J. G. EICHORN, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1783).

<sup>2</sup> J. WELLHAUSEN, *Die Composition des Hexateuch und der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments* (3rd ed.; Berlin: Reimer, 1899).

<sup>3</sup> J. VAN SETERS, *Abraham in History and Tradition* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1975).

<sup>4</sup> H. H. SCHMID, *Der sogenannte Jahwist* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1976).

<sup>5</sup> R. RENDTORFF, *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch* (BZAW 147; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977).

<sup>6</sup> See the still-groundbreaking work of E. BLUM, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990), 1: "What is often called a 'crisis' should instead be greeted as a newly discovered openness, as a chance to question in a self-critical manner and without pressing too quickly toward 'conclusions' in the form of dialogue-stopping hypotheses, and, moreover, to call into question the method and perspectives that are taken for granted." Cf., e.g., J. S. BADEN, *J, E, and the Composition of the Pentateuch* (FAT 72; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 10: "This study attempts some much-needed steps to pull biblical scholarship back from the precipice of the perceived 'crisis' in pentateuchal criticism."

ship, beginning with this latest break, have at the same time made it possible to accord increased attention to the sections of text within the Pentateuch that are evidently later than the Priestly document. It is not novel to reckon with material in the Pentateuch that, on the one hand, is not source material, and, on the other, concerns the expansion of the Pentateuch in its final literary stage. Nevertheless, the dominant strand of scholarship since Wellhausen has accepted that the literary history of the Pentateuch essentially ended with the combination of P and JE. Furthermore, it has accepted that this combination basically provided no impetus for the production of further expansions within the Pentateuch.<sup>7</sup> Wellhausen, for example, held with regard to the process of the combination of JE and P:

The activity of the redactor consists primarily in the skilled interweaving of the sources, in which he left their content as unabridged and the wording and order of the narrative as unchanged as possible. However, he was not always able to proceed without intrusions of his own. Sometimes he made additions, at times to overcome a contradiction or to cover over a seam.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> As significant exceptions – each within the framework of a completely different theoretical approach to the Pentateuch – mention should be made here of the works of B. JACOB (*Das erste Buch der Tora: Genesis* [New York: Schocken, 1934]) and R. N. WHYBRAY (*Introduction to the Pentateuch* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1989]). Both understand the Pentateuch as the work of one author who at the same time worked as the editor of all the traditional material, which he worked into the Pentateuch.

<sup>8</sup> WELLHAUSEN, *Composition* (see n. 2), 2; all translations are mine unless otherwise noted. Wellhausen reproduces here a perspective that has basically been adopted since Astruc (J. ASTRUC, *Conjectures sur les mémoires originaux dont il paroît que Moïse s'est servi pour composer le Livre de la Genèse* [Brussels: Fricx, 1753]). According to Astruc, Genesis consists of two sources that Moses as the redactor reworked, somewhat like a “harmonie des Evangelistes” (ASTRUC, *Conjectures*, 525), in order to bring them together (see M. WITTE, *Die biblische Urgeschichte: Redaktions- und theologiegeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu Gen 1,1–11,26* [BZAW 265; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1998], 2–3; J. C. GERTZ, “Jean Astruc and Source Criticism in the Book of Genesis,” in *Sacred Conjectures: The Context and Legacy of Robert Lowth and Jean Astruc* [ed. J. Jarick; LHBOTS 457; New York: Continuum, 2007], 190–203). Quite similarly, J. G. EICHHORN described a redactor who had a “holy respect” for the sources he set out to combine “without first filing down, changing, or tinkering with their expression” (*Einleitung in das Alte Testament: Vierte Original-Ausgabe, I–V* [Göttingen: Rosenbusch, 1823–1824], 99). A concise portrayal of the view of the final redactor of the Pentateuch in the eyes of nineteenth century scholars appears in WITTE, *Urgeschichte*, 1–16. It is remarkable that it was also possible for pentateuchal scholarship before Wellhausen to combine the final redaction of the Pentateuch with the insertion of broad sections of text. For example, F. BLEEK (*Einleitung in das Alte Testament: Vierte Auflage nach der von A. Kamphausen besorgten dritten bearbeitet von J. Wellhausen* [ed. J. Bleek and A. Kamphausen; Berlin: Reimer, 1878], 124–125), identified the Deuteronomist as the final redactor of the Pentateuch, who was also responsible for Lev 26: “Solely our Deuteronomy was undoubtedly written from the beginning as an addition and expansion of the older historical work, which was the same one that the Jehowistic redactor of the first four books of our Pentateuch received; and quite probably the author of Deuteronomy was also the final redactor of the entire Pentateuch, through whom the work

Nonetheless, Wellhausen did not see the composition of the Pentateuch as completely finished with the process that combined JE and P. Following Popper and Kuenen, Wellhausen reckoned with a *diaskeuast*,<sup>9</sup> who also edited the Pentateuch further after this combination: “The *diaskeuast*, with whom Kuenen correctly reckoned, already had the combined composition JE+Q in front of him and subjected it to further editing.”<sup>10</sup>

On a related matter, it is important to note that Wellhausen emphasized on multiple occasions, in particular in *Composition*, that “the literary process was in reality more complicated, and the so-called Supplementary Hypothesis is still applicable in a subordinate role.”<sup>11</sup> With regard to the Priestly document, Wellhausen speaks of “secondary and tertiary levels,”<sup>12</sup> though it appears that he hardly considered the alternative that such “secondary and tertiary” elements could simply be additions to P itself rather than to the Priestly document combined with JE.

The term *diaskeuast*, employed by Wellhausen, did not, however, originate with Kuenen.<sup>13</sup> In its application to the biblical texts,<sup>14</sup> and in the less common

---

obtained the extent and configuration in which it now appears to us. Because this was then combined with a new copy of the preexisting work, it can be considered that individual [texts] in the previous books were also changed or interpolated by his hand. But in my view this is only probable with regard to the earlier [...] discussed section Lev 26:2–45, whose entire tone and character are unmistakably very similar to the speech of Deuteronomy.” Wellhausen allowed these explanations to remain in the fourth edition of the *Einleitung*, which he edited, but he added, in §§ 81–87, a further section entitled “Progress of Hexateuchal Criticism since Bleek’s Death.”

<sup>9</sup> R. G. KRATZ, “Wellhausen,” *TRE* 35:527–536, here 529, explains *diaskeuast* as “*Fort-schreibung* [expansion], in the manner understood today following Walther Zimmerli.”

<sup>10</sup> WELLHAUSEN, *Composition* (see n. 2), 329.

<sup>11</sup> WELLHAUSEN, *Composition* (see n. 2), 207. On this, see S. GESUNDHEIT, *Three Times a Year: Studies in Festival Legislation in the Pentateuch* (FAT 82; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 233, n. 16, with references to similar declarations on pp. 135, 137, 178–179, 192.

<sup>12</sup> WELLHAUSEN, *Composition* (see n. 2), 178, n. 1.

<sup>13</sup> On the relationship between Wellhausen and Kuenen, see R. SMEND, “Kuenen und Wellhausen,” in *Abraham Kuenen (1828–1891): His Major Contributions to the Study of the Old Testament* (ed. P. B. Dirksen and A. van der Kooij; Leiden: Brill, 1993), 113–127, here 125; IDEM, “The Work of Abraham Kuenen and Julius Wellhausen,” in *From Modernism to Post-Modernism (The Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries)*, vol. 3 of *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation* (ed. M. Sæbø; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 424–453.

<sup>14</sup> It appears prominently in F. SCHLEGEL (e.g., *Geschichte der Poesie der Griechen und Römer* [Berlin: Unger, 1798], 170) and plays an important role in classical philology; see A. GRÄFENHAN, *Geschichte der Klassischen Philologie im Alterthum* (Bonn: 1843), 264: “With regard to Homeric poems, these are interpolated by the diaskeuasts not only in individual verses but also through insertion of larger sections, which the old grammarians have in part uncovered with great acumen.”

form *diaskeue*, it goes back to Julius Popper,<sup>15</sup> who appears in Wellhausen's *Composition* as "the learned rabbi."<sup>16</sup> In 1862, Popper published a work on Exod 25–40,<sup>17</sup> in which he argued that "the second part [namely the report of the Tent of Meeting, i.e., Exod 35–40] is a later sprouting trunk of our description [namely, Exod 25–29]."<sup>18</sup> Popper compares Exod 25–31 with 35–40 and portrays the "amplifications" in Exod 35–40 as interpretations: "it is almost the traditional material, but the content itself that appears here in its fuller and more correct form has been interpreted and developed more richly and precisely."<sup>19</sup> In contrast, he places great value on the text-critical differences between in the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint and combines these phenomena with the latest expansions in the Pentateuch. As a result, he interprets the "additions and interpolations in the Samaritan Pentateuch as the extensions and degener-

<sup>15</sup> Not, however, exclusively; see J. VAN SETERS, *The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the "Editor" in Biblical Criticism* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 237, n. 173. Wellhausen was also familiar with the term from O. THENIUS, *Die Bücher Samuels erklärt* (2nd ed.; Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1864) (which refers to the *masoretische Diaskeuase*). On Popper, see R. HACHEM, *Reclaiming the Hebrew Bible: German-Jewish Reception of Biblical Criticism* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 137–141.

<sup>16</sup> WELLHAUSEN, *Composition* (see n. 2), 146. Wellhausen offers a longer discussion of Popper in his revision of Bleek's *Einleitung* (BLEEK, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* [see n. 8], 155–156): "His investigation comes to the conclusion that the descriptions of the building of the tabernacle (Exod 35–49) and the dedication of the priests (Lev 8–10) are later than the prescriptions concerning the two matters in Exod 25–31 – actually they only reach the form in which we now have them considerably later than the Babylonian captivity. It is written in a quite circular fashion; furthermore, the question itself is complicated because the author does not build his hypothesis only on the Masoretic, but also on the Samaritan, text and especially the Greek translation. [...] The earliest layer is not – as was generally accepted before him – made of one piece but was the product of a long, continuous *diaskeue*, as Popper calls it, in which the scribes following Ezra were the last to lay a hand upon it. [...] It is very regrettable that the German scholars investigating *Composition* after the time of Popper have gained no insight from his book or at least excused themselves from the study of it: only Geiger (Jüd. Zeitschr. für Wiss. und Leben I S. 122ff.) and Graf (die Geschichtsbücher des A. T. S. 86–87) constitute exceptions. This is totally unjust. I must be very mistaken in my estimation of Popper's book if it does not go on to exercise considerable influence."

<sup>17</sup> J. POPPER, *Der biblische Bericht über die Stiftshütte: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Composition und Diaskeue des Pentateuch* (Leipzig: Hunger, 1862).

<sup>18</sup> POPPER, *Der biblische Bericht* (see n. 17). On Popper, see also H. UTZSCHNEIDER, *Das Heiligtum und das Gesetz: Studien zur Bedeutung der sinaitischen Heiligtumstexte (Ex 25–40; Lev 8–9)* (OBO 77; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag, 1988), 30; GESUNDHEIT, *Three Times a Year* (see n. 11), 232–234; T. RÖMER, "'Higher Criticism': The Historical and Literary-Critical Approach – with Special Reference to the Pentateuch," in *From Modernism to Post-Modernism (The Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries)*, vol. 3 of *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation* (ed. M. Sæbø; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 393–423, here 421–422.

<sup>19</sup> POPPER, *Der biblische Bericht* (see n. 17), 147; see also UTZSCHNEIDER, *Heiligtum* (see n. 18), 31.

ations from the pentateuchal diaskeuast.<sup>20</sup> In any case, Popper's book marks the first comprehensive evaluation of the post-Priestly interpretative work in the Pentateuch. Popper still views the Priestly document as the oldest source of the Pentateuch, however, even though he sees the process of its extensions continuing to the year 260 BCE.<sup>21</sup> In fact, Popper also basically views the redaction-historical developments of the Pentateuch in terms of a model of decadence, though he recognizes the importance of these late "amplifications":

The period of actual creative composition thus lay far in the past [in relation to] all these reshaping and changes, so we have here also nothing more than stylistic and copyediting activities, with the mere formal finishing of the received material concerning its diaskeuastic revisions and arrangements. Yet in this period the Pentateuch receives its formal shape, which should provide scholarship with a much larger field of activity than one usually is inclined to accept.<sup>22</sup>

Not only Wellhausen but also Kuenen read Popper. Kuenen adopted the term *diaskeue* from Popper:

The redaction of the Hexateuch, then, assumes the form of a continuous diaskeue or diorthosis, and the redactor becomes a collective body headed by the scribe who united the two works [...] into a single whole, but also including the whole series of his more or less independent followers.<sup>23</sup>

A consensus was then established that on the one hand emphasized the final compiler's passivity and lack of originality and on the other granted the presence of still-later expansions or a post-final-redaction incorporation of specific individual source texts.<sup>24</sup> This position appears, for example, in Gunkel's commentary on Genesis. He holds to the notion of a final redactor, whom he views more as a collector, like the authors of the source documents:

P's attempt to suppress the old failed; and a pious hand brought about a combination of JE and P. This final collection took place with extraordinary fidelity, especially to

<sup>20</sup> POPPER, *Der biblische Bericht* (see n. 17), 67.

<sup>21</sup> POPPER, *Der biblische Bericht* (see n. 17), 7.

<sup>22</sup> POPPER, *Der biblische Bericht* (see n. 17), 73.

<sup>23</sup> A. KUENEN, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Pentateuch* (trans. Ph. H. Wicksteed; London: Macmillan, 1886), 315; see also IDEM, *De Godsdienst van Israel II* (Harlem: Kruseman, 1870), 265–266.

<sup>24</sup> The acceptance of the sporadic appearance of post-Priestly portions of text in the Pentateuch can also be found in some contributions from more recent, though also more traditionally oriented, pentateuchal scholars in the German-speaking sphere, e.g., H. SEEBASS, "Gehörten Verheißungen zum ältesten Bestand der Väter-Erzählungen?," *Bib* 64 (1983), 189–210, here 207, n. 48; W. H. SCHMIDT, *Exodus* (BK 2/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 318; P. WEIMAR, *Untersuchungen zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (BZAW 146; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977), 142; IDEM, *Die Berufung des Mose: Literaturwissenschaftliche Analyse von Exodus 2,23–5,5* (OBO 32; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag, 1980), 16, 287, 321; S. MITTMANN, *Deuteronomium 1:1–6:3 literarkritisch und traditionsgeschichtlich untersucht* (BZAW 139; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975), 56.



P; its author attempted wherever possible to prevent any granule of P from falling to the ground.<sup>25</sup>

What did this final collector himself formulate? Gunkel draws a modest conclusion:

We are able to infer very little in Genesis that with more or less certainty came from his hand: a few harmonizing glosses or fills like 10:24; 15:7, 8, 15; 27:46; in 35:13, 14; further retouching in 6:7; 7:7, 22, 23; and further 7:3a, 8, 9; then the distinction between Abram and Abraham, and Sarai and Sarah also in J and E, among others.<sup>26</sup>

After the combination of JE and P, Genesis, or the Pentateuch, respectively, had essentially received its shape. However, several later additions can be identified.

With this the activity of the redactors in Genesis is basically finished. But in individual [details] the work [*diaskeuase*] on the text continued much longer. We see small revisions in chapter 34 and in the numbers in the genealogies, in which the Jewish and Samaritan versions and the text of the Greek translation deviate from one another. Larger expansions and revisions still took place in 36 and 46:8–27; the final insertion is the narrative of Abraham's victory over the four kings, a "midrash"-like legend from the latest period.<sup>27</sup>

In his *History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (1948), Martin Noth emphasized even more strongly that the combination of JE and P meant the completion of the Pentateuch:

The formation of the entire Pentateuch, that is, the insertion of the J narrative that had been expanded by numerous E elements into the literary frame of P, is no longer of great relevance in terms of tradition history. It concerns a purely literary process that brought in neither new points of view in the editing of material nor interpretations of the material. It instead only amounts to a process of addition and is only important insofar as its result was the completed Pentateuch, as it comes to us as an extant entity from which we can extract the earlier stages through more or less certain analysis.<sup>28</sup>

This naturally does not categorically exclude that individual texts of the Pentateuch could first have been added after the combination of P and JE, but this possibility is limited to a few pieces that have no relation to one another; they are of neither great compositional nor theological importance.

This conviction appears in various standard introductions to the Old Testament from the post-World War II period, which maintain that the Pentateuch essentially consists of the composition of source documents, though it also contains individual pieces that were first added after this decisive compositional step. For example, Otto Eissfeldt identified Gen 14 and Gen 18:22b–33, as well as certain

<sup>25</sup> H. GUNKEL, *Genesis* (HKAT 1/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901), xcix.

<sup>26</sup> GUNKEL, *Genesis* (see n. 25), xcix.

<sup>27</sup> GUNKEL, *Genesis* (see n. 25), xcix.

<sup>28</sup> M. NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1948), 267–268.

legal texts, as post-Priestly additions.<sup>29</sup> Georg Fohrer similarly discussed the possibility of post-Priestly origins for individual texts outside the source layers such as Gen 14; Exod 15:1–19; Exod 19:3b–8; and Deut 32 – especially Exod 15:1–19 and Deut 32. He sees Gen 14 as an absorbed source text, and he dates Exod 19:3b–8 to the late monarchic period.<sup>30</sup>

It was only in the late 1970s – especially because of the effects of the “crisis”<sup>31</sup> in pentateuchal scholarship perceived in the immediately preceding years – that the introductory literature to the Old Testament began to include programmatic statements on the necessity of placing more value on the work of the combination of the traditional pentateuchal sources as a literary-historical procedure with an importance all its own.<sup>32</sup> For example, Rudolf Smend writes:

The theological and intellectual-historical status of this combination [of the source documents] forbids evaluating it in passing and dedicating interest more or less solely to the works extracted through the separation of sources that the redactor had before him. It would be valid to apply and extend the results of the “Documentary Hypothesis” much more strongly in the reverse sense.<sup>33</sup>

Smend specifically points out that during the combination of P and JE, one should also expect the insertion of new portions of text:

The school that we call R did not limit itself to the joining of the received source documents. They instead subjected the new whole to a further redaction. [...] This is one of the most important domains for the Supplementary Hypothesis.<sup>34</sup>

In this judgment, Smend explicitly follows Kuenen, who conceived of the redactor as a “collective whose head is the one that combined the two [...] sources into a whole, to whom, however, in addition a number of more or less independent successors belonged.”<sup>35</sup> Smend explicitly pointed out the long-term

---

<sup>29</sup> O. EISSFELDT, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament unter Einschluß der Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen sowie der apokryphen und pseudepigraphenartigen Qumran-Schriften* (3rd ed.; NThG; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1964), 280.

<sup>30</sup> G. FOHRER, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1965), 202–206.

<sup>31</sup> See above, n. 6.

<sup>32</sup> The dictum from H.-W. HERTZBERG is frequently cited: “still missing is the book about the author of it all, the final redactor” (“Ist Exegese theologisch möglich?,” in *Beiträge zur Traditionsgeschichte und Theologie des Alten Testaments* [ed. H.-W. Hertzberg; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962], 101–117, here 111; see J. C. GERTZ, *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung* [FRLANT 186; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000], 13).

<sup>33</sup> R. SMEND, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (ThW 1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1978), 38.

<sup>34</sup> SMEND, *Die Entstehung* (see n. 33), 46.

<sup>35</sup> A. KUENEN, *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die Bücher des alten Testaments hinsichtlich ihrer Entstehung und Sammlung*, Bd. I/1 (Leipzig: J. C. Mathes, 1887), 302; cf. GERTZ, *Tradition* (see n. 29), 16.

development of the legal texts in the Torah, which should also be evaluated from this perspective.

In addition to the works of Van Seters, Schmid, and Rendtorff, there was also the often-forgotten contribution by Eberhard Ruprecht from 1974, which is important for the history of scholarship. Before these other authors, Ruprecht developed an exemplary, complex analysis of the post-Priestly growth of the original Priestly version of Exod 16:

The oldest literary level is the Priestly narrative in verses 1–3, 6–7, 9–27, 30, 35a. The next layer is a Deuteronomistic redaction in 15:25b–26; 16:4–5, 28–29, 31–32. It already has the combination of JE and P before it. The latest layer is an addition in Priestly style in verses 33–34. [...] This is quite a striking conclusion because such a stratification has not yet been observed in pentateuchal scholarship.<sup>36</sup>

Though Wellhausen had already suspected post-Priestly exegesis in the context of Exod 16:4–5, he went on to conclude that instead an older JE fragment had been worked into this location: “Could it then be that the *diaskeuast* originally divined this from the report of Q and placed it in verses 4–5? Such critical insight cannot really be expected from him.”<sup>37</sup> This argument is not actually based on the evidence; it arises from a particular prior understanding of what a *diaskeuast* can or cannot do.<sup>38</sup>

Whereas Ruprecht presented a limited textual example of the phenomenon of post-Priestly redactional activity, D.J.A. Clines’s volume *The Theme of the Pentateuch* develops a completely different approach.<sup>39</sup> His book is noteworthy in that it is the first time that the specific redactional outlook of the present form of the Pentateuch is investigated. Nonetheless, though Clines’s monograph was synchronically rather than redaction-historically oriented,<sup>40</sup> he still explicitly formulated the investigation as a search for the “final redactor.”<sup>41</sup> Yet the classical conception of a compiler that only intervenes minimally is quite operative in Clines’s work: “First, the final redactor can, with minimal interference, re-shape the total impact of his material [...]. Secondly, it is not necessary to posit that the shape of the final work was *intended* by the redactor.”<sup>42</sup>

<sup>36</sup> E. RUPRECHT, “Stellung und Bedeutung der Erzählung vom Mannawunder (Ex 16) im Aufbau der Priesterschrift,” *ZAW* 86 (1974), 269–307, here 302.

<sup>37</sup> WELLHAUSEN, *Composition* (see n. 2), 329.

<sup>38</sup> R. SMEND, *Die Erzählung des Hexateuch auf ihre Quellen untersucht* (Berlin: Reimer, 1912), 149, also recognizes the work of a *diaskeuase* in Exod 16.

<sup>39</sup> D.J.A. CLINES, *The Theme of the Pentateuch* (2nd ed.; JSOTSup; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).

<sup>40</sup> It is noteworthy that the search for the redactional outlook of the present Pentateuch is also treated as a synchronic question in more recent scholarship; see, e.g., E. W. NICHOLSON, *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Wellhausen* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 249–268.

<sup>41</sup> CLINES, *Themes* (see n. 38), 102.

<sup>42</sup> CLINES, *Themes* (see n. 38), 25.

Clines identifies the “theme of the Pentateuch” as follows:

The theme of the Pentateuch is the partial fulfilment – which implies also the partial non-fulfilment – of the promise to or blessings of the patriarchs. The promise of blessing is both the divine initiative of the world where human initiatives always lead to disaster, and are an affirmation of the primal divine intentions for humanity.<sup>43</sup>

With regard to the historical location of the redactor, Clines remains quite vague. He locates the composition of the Pentateuch in the Babylonian exile.<sup>44</sup>

At the same time as Clines’s volume, the first publication in the German-speaking sphere actually dedicated to the discussion of the redactor as such appeared, namely H. Donner’s study.<sup>45</sup> In contrast to Clines, Donner interpreted the “redactor” as neither an actively nor a passively creative spirit but rather a compiler whose task consisted of “combining the literarily existing texts with one another in such a way that a new text emerged from multiple texts with the preservation of everything essential and with as few omissions as possible.”<sup>46</sup> The redactors were “not inventors of great theological designs, but precritical scribal exegetes.” Donner’s study was significant in that it was completely focused on the phenomenon and the inner logic of redaction.<sup>47</sup> It was limited, however, by a preconception stated at the outset of the essay of the limited nature of what a redactor could be conceived as doing, namely, compiling existing textual materials as passively as possible. Donner’s understanding is supported by his choices about which texts to investigate. He begins with a discussion of Exod 14 rather than texts that evince productive redactional interpretations of preexisting material.

Erhard Blum, in his 1990 *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, was the first in the history of scholarship to accord substantial attention to post-Priestly textual growth in the Pentateuch.<sup>48</sup> This is true even though he separates this

<sup>43</sup> CLINES, *Themes* (see n. 38), 30.

<sup>44</sup> CLINES, *Themes* (see n. 38), 103: “As is generally assumed, the redaction of the Pentateuch took place in Babylonia.” See also – and more emphatically – 104: “The Pentateuch, even if it was composed after 539 BCE, is still an exilic work.”

<sup>45</sup> H. DONNER, “Der Redaktor: Überlegungen zum vorkritischen Umgang mit der Heiligen Schrift (1978),” in *Aufsätze zum Alten Testament aus vier Jahrzehnten* (ed. H. Donner; BZAW 224; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), 259–285.

<sup>46</sup> DONNER, “Der Redaktor” (see n. 45), 262–263; see the summary on 283–285.

<sup>47</sup> DONNER, “Der Redaktor” (see n. 45), 282.

<sup>48</sup> See n. 6. At the same time, J. HUGHES, *Secrets of Times: Myth and History in Biblical Chronology* (JSOTSup 66; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 93, points out a “post-priestly revision” of the royal chronology. On the suggestion of a Hasmonaean redaction in Gen 5 – the chapter that provides the basis for calculating universal time (see K. SCHMID, *Erzväter und Exodus: Untersuchungen zur doppelten Begründung der Ursprünge Israels in den Geschichtsbüchern des Alten Testaments* [WMANT 81; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1999], 19–22) – see R. HENDEL, “A Hasmonaean Edition of MT Genesis? The Implications of the Editions of the Chronology in Genesis 5,” *HBAI* 1 (2012), 448–464.

stage from the two earlier primary steps in terms of classification. The first main section of his book is introduced as “Part One: The Pre-Priestly Composition (KD).”<sup>49</sup> This is followed by “Part Two: The Priestly Composition (KP),”<sup>50</sup> and the final section receives the heading “Outlook: On the Way to the Canonical ‘Final Form.’”<sup>51</sup> Even though Blum generally connects the essential aspects of the formation of the Pentateuch with P’s incorporation into the pre-Priestly texts, he still emphasizes the programmatic importance of the post-Priestly development:

Even if we might see the shaping of the principal Priestly composition as the decisive formative step on the way to the canonical Torah, this is by no means to be equated with its “final form.” The shaping of tradition continues considerably. For one – there can hardly be controversy about this – within the Priestly circles “its” material was perpetuated, actualized, etc., for a longer period of time. Furthermore, however, there were also more or less punctiliar revisions/additions from the circle that was in the broadest sense made up of “Deuteronomistic” tradents.<sup>52</sup>

Blum refers initially to the work of E. Ruprecht on Exod 16<sup>53</sup> but also to that of N. Lohfink on Exod 15:25b, 26.<sup>54</sup> Blum himself identifies further post-Priestly expansions in the “Aaron components” of Exod 4 and the related texts in Exod 18;<sup>55</sup> in the texts of what he calls the “Josh 24 redaction,”<sup>56</sup> which begins in Gen 35:1–7 and is carried on by the series of declarations in Gen 50:25b, 26; Exod 13:19; and Josh 24:32;<sup>57</sup> as well as in the “Mal’ak redaction,”<sup>58</sup> with which one “can reckon with Exod 14:19a; 23:20ff.\*; (32:34aβ) 33:2, 3b\*, 4; 34:11–27, and Judg 2:1–5.”<sup>59</sup>

<sup>49</sup> BLUM, *Komposition des Pentateuchs* (see n. 6), 7.

<sup>50</sup> BLUM, *Komposition des Pentateuchs* (see n. 6), 219.

<sup>51</sup> BLUM, *Komposition des Pentateuchs* (see n. 6), 361.

<sup>52</sup> BLUM, *Komposition des Pentateuchs* (see n. 6), 361.

<sup>53</sup> BLUM, *Komposition des Pentateuchs* (see n. 6), 361. See also RUPRECHT, “Stellung und Bedeutung” (see n. 36).

<sup>54</sup> N. LOHFINK, “‘Ich bin Jahwe, dein Arzt’ (Ex 15,26): Gott, Gesellschaft und menschliche Gesundheit in einer nachexilischen Pentateuchbearbeitung (Ex 15,25b.26),” in *‘Ich will euer Gott werden’: Beispiele biblischen Redens von Gott* (ed. N. Lohfink; SBS 100; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981), 11–73.

<sup>55</sup> BLUM, *Komposition des Pentateuchs* (see n. 6), 362.

<sup>56</sup> BLUM, *Komposition des Pentateuchs* (see n. 6), 363. See also IDEM, “Die literarische Verbindung von Erzvätern und Exodus: Ein Gespräch mit neueren Endredaktionshypothesen,” in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. J. C. Gertz et al.; BZAW 315; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 119–156, here 125, as well as M. WITTE, “Die Gebeine Josefs,” in *Auf dem Weg zur Endgestalt von Genesis bis II Regum* (ed. M. Beck and U. Schorn; BZAW 370; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 139–156.

<sup>57</sup> BLUM, *Komposition des Pentateuchs* (see n. 6), 363.

<sup>58</sup> BLUM, *Komposition des Pentateuchs* (see n. 6), 377.

<sup>59</sup> BLUM, *Komposition des Pentateuchs* (see n. 6), 363.

In his 1984 *Komposition der Vätergeschichte*, Blum was still quite hesitant to identify post-Priestly portions of text, except for texts like Gen 14<sup>60</sup> and the series connected with Josh 24<sup>61</sup> in which Blum deduced a clear relationship to KP. Blum only later designated the D texts in Genesis, such as Gen 24 (which he assigned to D in 1984), as post-Priestly.<sup>62</sup>

Christoph Levin's work accentuates the post-Priestly redactional activities even more clearly than Blum did, calling them "post-end-redactional." Levin continues to view the most important redactional step in the process of the composition of the Pentateuch as the – easily misunderstood<sup>63</sup> – "end redaction," which combined J and P. This process points to the shared form and equal value of J and P.<sup>64</sup> Nevertheless, it is still the case that

[t]he combination of the Yahwist and the Priestly documents does not even come close to bringing the history of the Pentateuch to a close. One of the surprises that has resulted from our investigation is the considerable extent of the text that was added after the end redaction. The established designation "end redaction" cannot be taken literally. This is not solely the case for the legal portions of the books of Exodus through Numbers. The movements concerned with theodicy, those that are moralizing, and the wisdom tendencies in the narratives of Genesis were largely added after the combination of the Yahwist and the Priestly documents. Those layers that the Documentary Hypothesis has to this point attributed to the "Elohist" are also included. The non-Priestly promises to the ancestors, to the extent that they do not come from a Yahwistic redactor, were also first inserted subsequent to the end redaction. Also post-end-redactional are the system of the twelve tribes, the apologetic in the cycle of the Egyptian plagues, and a large part of the wilderness traditions. The promise of the land and the conquest of the land also receive their present meaning quite late. The current Pentateuch to a great degree first came about through post-end-redactional additions.<sup>65</sup>

<sup>60</sup> E. BLUM, *Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (WMANT 57; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1984), 462–464, n. 5.

<sup>61</sup> BLUM, *Komposition der Vätergeschichte* (see n. 60), 44–61.

<sup>62</sup> BLUM, "Verbindung" (see n. 56), 140–144.

<sup>63</sup> In light of the presence of "post-end-redactional" texts in the Pentateuch, the use of the designation "end redaction" for the process of the combination of J and P is a contradiction in terms. See also BLUM, *Komposition des Pentateuch* (see n. 6), 380: "There is no 'end redaction.'" Similarly, C. FREVEL, in *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (ed. E. Zenger and C. Frevel; 8th ed.; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2012), 148. GERTZ explains the terminological use as follows: "To the degree to which the merging of the two text complexes [i.e., the Priestly and the non-Priestly] is reckoned with as the process that definitively marked the formation of the present canonical text, it should be called the end redaction. The term *end redaction* would, then, not be understood as the process responsible for the text-critically mediated 'final text,' and the use of the term does not contain a presupposition about whether it is to be understood as addressing the combination of independent narrative works or one of the two entities as an end-redactional editorial layer" (*Tradition* [see n. 32], 10).

<sup>64</sup> C. LEVIN, *Der Jahwist* (FRLANT 157; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 437.

<sup>65</sup> LEVIN, *Der Jahwist* (see n. 64), 440–441. See also IDEM, *Das Alte Testament* (Munich: Beck, 2001), 81–85.

This final statement is especially applicable in the context of more recent scholarly contributions that place the literary combination of the non-Priestly ancestral and exodus traditions only after the composition of the Priestly document.<sup>66</sup> This post-Priestly redaction already had a model for its activity in the Priestly document, which unquestionably presupposed the combination of the ancestors and the exodus and from this perspective can be reckoned as the first proto-Pentateuch in terms of its content.<sup>67</sup>

The two recognizable narratives in Exod 1–14 (15) were combined in the end redaction. This is characterized first by the fact that it attempts to preserve its sources, to the degree that they can be recognized, as completely as possible and according to their wording.

The end redaction attempts, at the same time, “to combine the preexisting narratives to an overarching view through its own expansions.”<sup>68</sup>

In reality, Jan Christian Gertz apportions extensive original formulations to the end redaction (e.g., Exod 1:8–10; 3:12–15\*, 18–20; 4:1–17, 21–23, 27–31; 5:1–6:1\*; 8:21–27; 9:15–23\*; 10:21–27; 12:18–20, 42–51), whereas the “expansions to the end-redactional text”<sup>69</sup> are identified as rather small in scale (the most extensive passages according to Gertz are Exod 1:1–6 and Exod 12:14–17<sup>70</sup>).

---

<sup>66</sup> Cf. A. DE PURY, “Le cycle de Jacob comme légende autonome des origines d’Israël,” in *Congress Volume: Leuven, 1989* (ed. J. A. Emerton; VTSup 43; Leiden: Brill, 1991), 78–96; SCHMID, *Erzväter* (see n. 45); GERTZ, *Tradition* (see n. 32), 381–388; E. OTTO, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und im Hexateuch* (FAT 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000); IDEM, *Mose: Geschichte und Legende* (Munich: Beck, 2006); IDEM, *Das Gesetz des Mose* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2007); J. L. SKA, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 196–202; critiqued by, e.g., T. B. DOZEMAN, “The Commission of Moses and the Book of Genesis,” in *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation* (ed. T. B. Dozeman and K. Schmid; SBLSymS 34; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 107–129; J. VAN SETERS, “The Patriarchs and the Exodus: Bridging the Gap between Two Origin Traditions,” in *The Interpretation of Exodus* (ed. R. Roukema; CBET 44; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 1–15; H.-C. SCHMITT, “Erzväter- und Exodusgeschichte als konkurrierende Ursprungslegenden Israels – Ein Irrweg der Pentateuchforschung,” in *Die Erzväter in der biblischen Tradition* (ed. A. C. Hagedorn and H. Pfeiffer; BZAW 400; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 241–266; G. I. DAVIES, “The Transition from Genesis to Exodus,” in *Genesis, Isaiah and Psalms* (ed. K. J. Dell et al.; VTSup 135; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 59–78.

<sup>67</sup> See esp. A. DE PURY, “Pg as the Absolute Beginning,” in *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l’Hexateuque et de l’Ennéateuque* (ed. T. Römer and K. Schmid; BETL 203; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 99–128; repr. in *Die Patriarchen und die Priesterschrift/Les Patriarches et le document sacerdotal: Gesammelte Studien zu seinem 70. Geburtstag/Recueil d’articles, à l’occasion de son 70e anniversaire* (ed. A. de Pury; ATANT 99; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2010), 13–42.

<sup>68</sup> GERTZ, *Tradition* (see n. 32), 391.

<sup>69</sup> GERTZ, *Tradition* (see n. 32), 394–396.

<sup>70</sup> GERTZ, *Tradition* (see n. 32).

Markus Witte draws a comparable picture for Gen 1–11. He also views the end redactor as textually productive, on the one hand taking over preexisting texts in his primeval history<sup>71</sup> and on the other inserting a series of his own formulations into the text that he arranges.<sup>72</sup>

The post-Priestly texts of the Pentateuch (and Hexateuch) receive special attention from and are accorded particular importance by Eckart Otto and Reinhard Achenbach, even though they do not clearly define the content and diachronic order of either the post-Priestly Pentateuch or the Hexateuch redactions:

The conceptions of the primary Dtr redactor of Deuteronomy (DtrD) and the Dtr author who combined Deuteronomy and the book of Joshua (DtrL) play key roles in the post-Priestly conceptions of the Pentateuch and Hexateuch. The Pentateuch and Hexateuch were developed from Deuteronomy with the integration of the Priestly document. [...] This complex redactional process need in no way be attributed to only one author. It is more likely to have been the result of a school of tradition. This is supported by insertions in the spirit of the Hexateuch redaction into the Pentateuch redaction, which itself is later than the Hexateuch redaction, which react to the Pentateuch and vice versa.<sup>73</sup>

At the same time, the Hexateuch and Pentateuch redactions are conceptually quite different in outlook:

The author of the Hexateuch presents a broad Israelite understanding of the land of Israel that includes the inhabitants of the ancient state of Israel with its center in Shechem (Josh 24). In the Pentateuch redaction, the reduced Judean diaspora perspective connected to Ezra prevails. It represses the salvific importance of the land in favor of the Torah. "Israel" is the place where the law is fulfilled. The written Torah assumes the role of the Mosaic mediation of the law so that only law that can be reckoned Mosaic is accorded authority. After the conclusion of the Sinai pericope, controversial laws like those concerning the inheritance rights of daughters (Num 27:1–11) as well as the controversial rationales for the responsibilities of priests, Levites [...] and the laity (Lev 10; Num 16–18\*) are clarified post-redactionally in Leviticus and Numbers until the Pentateuch is finally closed and no longer expanded in the late fourth century BCE.<sup>74</sup>

According to Achenbach, the book of Numbers as a whole is a literary product of the Pentateuch and Hexateuch redactions as well as a further theocratic editing.

<sup>71</sup> E.g., Gen 6:1–4 and various lists; see WITTE, *Urgeschichte* (see n. 8), 334. For a post-Priestly date for Gen 6:1–4, see W. BÜHRER, "Göttersöhne und Menschentöchter: Gen 6,1–4 als innerbiblische Schriftauslegung," *ZAW* 123 (2011), 495–515.

<sup>72</sup> E.g., Gen 2:9b–15 as well as the numerous redactional elements in the flood and tower of Babel narratives; see WITTE, *Urgeschichte* (see n. 8), 334.

<sup>73</sup> OTTO, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch* (see n. 66), 243–244. See also IDEM, "Pentateuch," *RGK* (4th ed.) 6:1089–1102, here 1097: "Key to the compositional history of the Pentateuch is the combination of Deut and P into a Pentateuch. The tensions between their different theologies spur the process of scribal mediation between them in the postexilic period through a hexateuchal and a pentateuchal redaction [...] whose result is the Pentateuch."

<sup>74</sup> OTTO, "Pentateuch" (see n. 73), 1101.



[T]he pre-Dtr material of the book of Numbers is from then on only accessible as part of the Hexateuch; its preservation comes as a result of a Hexateuch redaction. As a result an abundance of traditions are preserved that the Deuteronomists had omitted.<sup>75</sup>

Thomas Römer similarly remarks:

Apparently these texts could at that point only be admitted to the book of Numbers because the other four books had already achieved proto-canonical status. In reality, Lev 26:46, or as the case may be Lev 27:43, clearly close the Sinai revelation. [...] Afterward, the Sinai pericope was expanded by Num 1–10, and this lengthening was added with a new superscription.<sup>76</sup>

The approach taken by Achenbach and Römer to the book of Numbers corresponds, *mutatis mutandis*, to the results yielded by Christophe Nihan's analysis of the book of Leviticus. He still finds portions of the original Priestly layer in Leviticus and allocates Lev 1–3; 8–9; and 11–15 to this layer, the end of which he detects in Lev 16.<sup>77</sup> However, it is especially in the Holiness Code (Lev 17–26) that post-Priestly expansion becomes palpable, and it should be interpreted in connection with the formation of the first edition of a Pentateuch:

H was actually conceived from the beginning in the prospect of a synoptic reading of the so-called “legal” codes comprised within the Torah/Pentateuch. This observation, as well as the nature of the process of inner-biblical exegesis reflected in H, demonstrates that the composition of this code should be related to a first edition of the Pentateuch, as suggested by E. Otto. [...] Against E. Otto the classical observation of H's distinctive terminology and theology indicates that H is not simply the work of a “pentateuchal redactor”, but rather a distinct priestly scribal school, as argued by I. Knohl and J. Mil-

<sup>75</sup> R. ACHENBACH, “Numeri und Deuteronomium,” in *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk* (ed. E. Otto and R. Achenbach, FRLANT 206; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 23–134, here 124.

<sup>76</sup> T. RÖMER, “Das Buch Numeri und das Ende des Jahwisten: Anfragen zur ‘Quellenscheidung’ im vierten Buch des Pentateuchs,” in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngsten Diskussion* (ed. J.C. Gertz et al.; BZAW 315; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 215–231, here 223; cf. also R.G. KRATZ, “The Pentateuch in Current Research: Consensus and Debate,” in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* (ed. T.B. Dozeman et al.; FAT 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 31–61, here 54: “In Numbers we have very few traces of a pre-Priestly tradition. This, however, does not mean that the book as a whole can be declared a post-Priestly document.” See further H. SEEBASS, “Pentateuch,” in *TRE* 26:185–209, here 203, for whom Numbers is essentially post-Priestly. A good overview of the discussion is offered by C. FREVEL, “The Book of Numbers: Formation, Composition, and Interpretation of a Late Part of the Torah; Some Introductory Remarks,” in *Torah and the Book of Numbers* (ed. C. Frevel et al.; FAT 2/62; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 1–37.

<sup>77</sup> C. NIHAN, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus* (FAT 2/25; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 20–68. On this discussion, see also J.L. SKA, “Le récit sacerdotal: Une ‘histoire sans fin’?” in *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers* (ed. T. Römer; BETL 215; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 631–653.

grom, to which the editing of the priestly document in Gen 1–Lev 16 was entrusted at the time of P's inclusion in the Pentateuch.<sup>78</sup>

Nihan works out a line of thought that was developed earlier by I. Knohl, who found numerous H insertions in the Pentateuch and saw H as the end redaction of the Pentateuch.<sup>79</sup> Eckart Otto presented quite a similar argument, “that the Holiness Law can be traced back to the authors of the Pentateuch redaction.”<sup>80</sup> In a detailed study of Lev 25:44–46,<sup>81</sup> Levinson shows how this text draws both on the manumission law in the Covenant Code and on Exod 1:13f. (P) and thus makes the argument that Lev 25 is post-P.

In accordance with these contributions to scholarship, the most recent pentateuchal discourse emphasizes the quantitative and qualitative importance of the final stages of the redaction history.<sup>82</sup> The most detailed, and in some ways excessive, reconstruction of the post-Priestly redaction history of the Pentateuch applied to the reconstruction of a specific section was presented in 2010 by Christoph Berner, on Exod 1–15. Berner attributed by far the largest portion of the exodus narrative to post-Priestly expansions, which, however, were generally unconnected with one another, focused on small amounts of text, and originated parallel to one another.<sup>83</sup>

There are, however, also radically opposing voices. The most critical objection surely comes from Joel Baden, who considers the supposition of a

<sup>78</sup> NIHAN, *From Priestly Torah* (see n. 76), 616–617.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. I. KNOHL, *The Sanctuary of Silence* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995, 59ff); IDEM, “Who Edited the Pentateuch?” in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* (ed. T.B. Dozeman et al.; FAT 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 359–367.

<sup>80</sup> E. OTTO, “Innerbiblische Exegese im Heiligkeitsetz Leviticus 17–26,” in *Die Tora: Studien zum Pentateuch: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (ed. E. Otto; BZABR 9; Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 2009), 46–106, here 95, n. 235.

<sup>81</sup> B.M. LEVINSON, “The Birth of the Lemma: The Restrictive Reinterpretation of the Covenant Code’s Manumission Law by the Holiness Code,” *JBL* 124 (2005), 617–639.

<sup>82</sup> E.g., SKA, *Introduction to Reading* (see n. 66), 217–229; J.C. GERTZ, ed., *Grundinformation Altes Testament: Eine Einführung in Literatur, Religion und Geschichte des Alten Testaments* (4th ed.; UTB 2745; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 214–217; D.M. CARR, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 216: “our present Pentateuch is, in large part, a product of a Priestly oriented conflation of the P and non-P documents along with late Priestly expansions of various non-P texts” (e.g., Gen 2:4a). Carr offers an entire chapter on these final layers of the composition of the Pentateuch: “The Final (Reconstructible) Stage of the Formation of the Pentateuch” (CARR, *Formation*, 215–217); cf. E. ZENGER and C. FREVEL, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (see n. 63), 148–160; T. RÖMER et al., eds., *Einleitung in das Alte Testament: Die Bücher der Hebräischen Bibel und die alttestamentlichen Schriften der katholischen, protestantischen und orthodoxen Kirchen* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2013), 155–164.

<sup>83</sup> C. BERNER, *Die Exoduserzählung: Das literarische Werden einer Ursprungserzählung Israels* (FAT 73; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010) (see also the review by K. SCHMID, *ZAW* 123 [2010], 292–294).

redactor to be a necessary but quite marginal element of the source theory that he defends:

[H]e is a necessary side-effect of the recognition of multiple sources in the text, not a primary feature of the theory. The theory demands a redactor, because the sources were evidently combined by someone – but no more than one.<sup>84</sup>

Whatever one might conclude about the conditions of the redactor within the framework of a scholarly project on “refining the Documentary Hypothesis”<sup>85</sup> that maximizes the role of supposed source texts, Julius Wellhausen cannot be claimed as the ancestor of this perspective. In a letter to Adolf Jülicher, he holds that “the Supplementary Hypothesis [has] validity” and that “the hypothesis of a mechanical mosaic [is] ludicrous.”<sup>86</sup>

The post-Priestly redaction history of the Pentateuch is truly a complex domain, and the editing process depends on numerous presuppositions about the nature of the composition of the Pentateuch as a whole. Nonetheless, recent scholarship has shown that this area can and should be investigated further.<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup> BADEN, *J. E. and the Redaction* (see n. 6), 8–9; see also 289, 305, as well as the detailed description on 255–286. See also the critical response by D.M. CARR to Baden in [http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/7801\\_8507.pdf](http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/7801_8507.pdf), accessed 10/13/14. B.J. Schwartz similarly determines the function of the redaction based on the example text of Gen 37; see B.J. SCHWARTZ, “How the Compiler of the Pentateuch Worked: The Composition of Genesis 37,” in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation* (ed. C.A. Evans et al.; VTSup 152; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 263–278; IDEM, “Joseph’s Descent into Egypt: The Composition of Genesis 37,” in *The Joseph Story in the Bible and throughout the Ages* (ed. L. Mazor; Beit Mikra 55; Jerusalem: Magnes, 2010), 1–30 (Hebrew).

<sup>85</sup> See J.S. BADEN, *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Refining the Documentary Hypothesis* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012).

<sup>86</sup> J. WELLHAUSEN, “Brief vom 8.11.1880,” in *Briefe* (ed. R. Smend; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 78.

<sup>87</sup> This field of investigation would expect and would include the description of complex conceptions of how the redaction history relates to the formation of the Pentateuch as Torah. See the initial reflections in K. SCHMID, “Der Abschluss der Tora als exegetisches und historisches Problem,” in *Schriftgelehrte Traditionsliteratur: Fallstudien zur innerbiblischen Schriftauslegung im Alten Testament* (ed. K. Schmid; FAT 77; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 159–184. A disciplined inclusion of the post-Priestly texts of the Pentateuch is offered by T. RÖMER, “Der Pentateuch,” in *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (ed. R. Smend et al.; 5th ed.; ThW 1/1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2014), 53–166.